

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8 and 11 have been amended. The amendments to at least claims 7 and 11 are only formal in nature. Claims 12-14 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-14 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5 and 11 have been amended to address the issues raised in the Office Action, and applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0057575 to Schwanz et al. (“Schwanz”). Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0010633 to Apfelback et al. (“Apfelback”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites “a light source that emits the light toward the reflector, provided inside the chassis, the light source arranged in such a manner that the light from the light source does not illuminate the window directly.” Schwanz and Apfelback fail to suggest at least this arrangement of light source, reflector and window as recited in independent claim 1.

Apfelback discloses a rear view mirror with a reflector 30 positioned between a lighting unit housing 12 and light transmitting plate 13. The reflector 30 reflects the light emitted by light sources 31 to the light transmitting plate 13 (page 2, paragraph [0021]).

In contrast to claim 1, however, Apfelback does not disclose an arrangement where its light sources emit light toward a reflector, where the light sources are arranged in such a manner that the light from the light sources do not illuminate a window on a portion of a chassis directly. Apfleback states in paragraph [0023]: “As is illustrated in FIG. 2, a portion of the light rays 32 emitted by the LEDs 31 are sent directly to the light transmitting plate 13.” Thus, in the Apfelback device, the LEDs 31 send some of their light directly to the light transmitting plate 13, which the Office Action equates with the window as recited in the claims. This is in direct contrast to claim 1, where light from the light source does not illuminate the window directly.

Schwanz also fails to disclose the arrangement of light source, reflector and window as recited in claim 1. The Office Action equates the light emitting diode 15, reflector aperture plate 20, and the light cover 6 of Schwanz with the light source, reflector, and window, respectively, as recited in the claims. In contrast to the arrangement of claim 1, however, the reflector aperture plate 20 of Schwanz is not arranged relative to the light emitting diode 15 such that light from the light emitting diode 15 is emitted toward the reflector aperture plate 20. In the Schwanz device, light from the light emitting diode 15 is coupled into the light guide 8, 8”, and passed to opposite disposed ends 16, 16’ of the light guide, where the light is coupled out within a range indicated by the arrows F in FIG. 2 (page 2, paragraph [0020]). As can be seen in FIG. 2, the light coupled out of the light guide 8 is not directed towards the reflector aperture plate 20, nor is the light emitted from the light emitting diode 15. Thus, Schwanz fails to suggest an arrangement of light source, reflector and window as recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 8 and 11 respectively recite, “a light source that emits the light toward the reflector, provided inside the chassis, the light source arranged in such a manner that the light from the light source does not illuminate the window directly”, and “a light source that emits light; and a reflector that reflects the light toward the opening, wherein the light source is arranged in such a manner that the light from the light source does not illuminate the opening directly.” Schwanz and Apfelback fail to disclose or suggest the arrangement of the light source, reflector and window as recited in claim 8, or the light source, reflector and opening as recited in claim 11, for reasons analogous to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, Schwanz and Apfelback do not disclose or suggest the feature of new claim 12 "wherein each light source of the lamp which is provided inside the chassis emits light toward the reflector, and each light source of the lamp is arranged in such a manner that the light from the light source does not illuminate the window directly", or the advantages of such a feature. The arrangement of reflector, light source, and window of claim 12 allows for the light from the light sources to be completely indirectly distributed by the reflector (See specification on page 8, lines 11-19), a feature not suggested by Schwanz or Apfelback. Dependent claims 13 and 14 recite similar features to that of claim 12.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 9, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438